

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 and 18-24 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 7, 10, 13, 16, 18 and 20 are amended. Claim 17 has been canceled. No new matter has been added.

In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all outstanding grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully request allowance of the application.

On page 2 of the Office Action, at paragraph 3, claims 7 and 10 are objected to because of informalities. As requested in the Office Action, “rout module” has been replaced by “route module” in claims 7 and 10. Therefore, the objections with respect to these claims are moot.

On pages 2-5 of the Office Action, claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 7,050,432 to Banavar et al. (hereinafter “Banavar”).

Applicants traverse these rejections.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 Fed. Cir. 1987).

Applicants submit that Banavar does not expressly or inherently describe each and every element of the claimed invention. For example, Banavar does not disclose or suggest “the routing box receives a filter and uses the filter to selectively transfer the digital content files to one or more of the plurality of cache servers,” as recited in independent claim 1 (as presented). Support for these features can be found in the Abstract, and specification beginning at page 7, line 18. Therefore, independent claim 1 is patentable over Banavar for at least these reasons.

With respect to independent claim 13, Banavar does not disclose or suggest “propagating a filter to a routing box in the network” or “content-based routing the distributed digital content to a plurality of cache servers using the filter to selectively route the digital content,” as claimed. Therefore, independent claim 13 is patentable over Banavar for at least these reasons.

Claims 2-12 depend from independent claim 1 and claims 14-16 and 18-24 depend from independent claim 13. Therefore, claims 2-12, 14-16 and 18-24 are in condition for allowance over the applied art for at least the reasons stated above and for the independently patentable features they recite.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this application.

If the Examiner believes that a personal or telephonic interview would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange for such a conference.

Date: May 23, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Sean Wooden
Reg. No. 43,997
ANDREWS KURTH LLP
1350 I Street, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 662-2738
Fax: (202) 662-2739